

**Remarks/Arguments:**

Pending claims 276-307 are canceled, claims 308-323 and 325-332 have been amended, claim 324 is canceled, and new claims 333-335 are added.

There were 57 claims prior to amendment, including 3 independent claims (276, 297 and 308), and after amendment there are 27 claims, including one independent claim (308). Thus, no additional claims fees are due.

No new matter is added by the amendments, which are supported by the original disclosure as discussed herein.

Applicant amends the independent claim to avoid the cited prior art. Applicant relies upon the fact that the remaining claims are dependent claims and in each case inherit the distinctiveness of the parent claim.

Applicant cancels claims 276-296 and subsumes their content within claims 308 and dependent claims 323 and 333. This change simplifies the claim structure but retains the scope of the invention as previously claimed.

## Election/Restriction

Applicant acknowledges Examiner's finding that applicant's response by virtue of amendment to claims 297-307 has not overcome the Election/Restriction. Applicant cancels the withdrawn claims.

## Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112

Applicant amends the claims to comply with the Examiner's requirement to use the Beauregard claim format.

## Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

Examiner rejects claims 276, 279-283, 285, 291-296, 308-315, 317-319, 321-324, and 327-332 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,029,141 to Bezos, et al.

## Summary for claims 308-336

In regard to claim 308 and its dependent claims, Bezos does not disclose or teach the limitations of the present invention as amended by applicant.

Applicant makes changes to claim 308 to further define what is meant by "dynamic," what the server is doing and what "originating from the third host" means.

Claim 308 now specifies the actor in each step, data and display from where to where is specified, dynamic is defined in terms of content from a database table, and a user accessing the virtual server is added to step three.

Bezos does not disclose a server performing the steps of claim 308 and none of the prior art of record discloses a server performing all of the steps of claim 308.

Bezos discloses a user accessing web sites selling products non-dynamically presented on static web pages. Bezos describes serving up dynamic web pages (essentially a shopping cart) but it does not describe a server requesting and receiving dynamic content from a database table at other web sites. Further, Bezos does not teach presenting that content as if the content originated on the server, as is required by claim 308. Finally, Bezos does not describe a server that controls all interfacing with the user.

#### Support for claim amendments

The new preamble to claim 308 is as required by the examiner. It is also supported at paragraph 65, 74 and 214 of the description. Conforming changes to the dependent claims to reference the new preamble in 308 were made.

Claim 308 step of “requesting first dynamic content from a first host wherein the first dynamic content is configured from a database table ...” is supported at paragraphs 131 and 138 of the description. The phrase “wherein requesting is performed by the server” is supported at paragraphs 137 and 138 of the description.

Claim 308 step of “requesting second dynamic content from a second host wherein the second dynamic content is configured from a database table is supported at paragraphs 131 and 138 of the description. The phrase “wherein requesting is performed by the server” is supported at paragraphs 137 and 138 of the description.

Claim 308 step of “receiving the first dynamic content and the second dynamic content at the server is supported at paragraph137 of the description.

Claim 308 step of “presenting a third host to a user accessing the server wherein the third host displays is supported at paragraph138 of the description.

Claim 311 was modified to convert the wherein clause to a step without substantive change.

Claims 322 and 323 were amended to add “javascript code,” which is supported at paragraphs 77 and 151 of the description; and “database object,” which is supported at paragraph 138 of the description.

Claim 323 was amended to add “and the second dynamic content,” which is supported by canceled claim 324. Combining these two claims presents a more concise claim set.

Claim 332 is supported by paragraphs 84, 102 and 140 of the description.

Claim 333 is supported by original claim 276 and at paragraphs 10 and 12 of the description.

Claims 334 and 335 are supported by paragraph 139 of the description.

## Conclusions

This response is intended to fully respond to the office action mailed 01-MAY-2009. It is timely filed within the 3-month shortened statutory period.


Amendments to the claims address the objections and rejections made in the office action.

No additional claims fees are due as a result of the submitted amendments. No new matter is added to the application by the amendments in this response.

Therefore, applicant respectfully requests further examination of his application based on the amendments submitted, that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case, and that the application be issued as a United States Patent.

Respectfully submitted,

Signed: 04-JUN-2009

\_\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_\_  


Louis Ventre, Jr.  
Registration No. 46254  
Registered Patent Attorney  
2483 Oakton Hills Drive  
Oakton, VA 22124-1530  
USPTO Customer Number 24221  
Telephone Number: 703-242-1247  
Facsimile Number: 703-783-7800